

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full response to the outstanding non-final Office Action, mailed July 13, 2004. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-8 and 16 are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Objection to Specification

The specification has been objected to as containing certain informalities. In response to the objection, the specification has been amended to overcome the stated objection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection of the specification be withdrawn.

3. Response to Objection To Drawings

The drawings have been objected to as containing certain informalities. In response to the objection, the drawings have been amended to overcome the stated objection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection of the drawings be withdrawn.

4. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-6 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Glenn* (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,229). For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e), the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

1. A method for forming a package for an electrical device, said method comprising the steps of:
forming isolated conductive features within a conductive material;
attaching a removable material to said surface of said conductive material after said isolated conductive features have been formed;
attaching encapsulant to said isolated conductive features and said removable material; and

removing said removable material from said conductive features
and said encapsulant.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Glenn* does not disclose, teach, or suggest anywhere in the specification or in the figures at least the above-highlighted feature of “attaching a removable material to said surface of said conductive material after said isolated conductive features have been formed,” as recited in claim 1.

Glenn is apparently limited to an approach for manufacturing a package for housing an integrated circuit device where a “metal sheet 13 is first attached to the adhesive first surface 11 of plastic sheet 10” and “[n]ext, metal sheet 13 is etched to form an array of package sites.” See, col. 3, lines 38-56; and FIG. 1. Therefore, *Glenn* fails to disclose all the features of claim 1.

b. Claims 2-6

Dependent claims 2-6 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

5. Response to Rejection of Claims 7-8 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Glenn* in view of *Wyland* (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,199) and *Weng* (U.S. Patent No. 5,972,234). In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the prior art reference must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. See, e.g., *In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Dependent claims 7-8 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that claims 7-8 depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for the allowability of claims 7-8, the claims recite further features/steps and/or combinations of

features/steps (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the prior art of record.

6. New Claim 16

Claim 16 has been newly added to further define and/or clarify the scope of one embodiment of the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 16 is allowable over the prior art, because the feature of the removable material being a mold stencil is not disclosed, suggested, or taught by the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-8 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 6. This Replacement Sheet, which contains FIG. 6, replaces the original sheet containing FIG. 6. In FIG. 6, a reference character 600 has been correctly changed to reference character 610.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet